DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 886 EA 020 707

AUTHOR Riegel, N. Blyth
TITLE Collecting and Using Student Information for School Improvement.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Computer Managed Instruction; *Computer Networks; Computer Uses in Education; *Database Management Systems; *Decision Making; *Educational Improvement; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Information Networks; Information Systems; *Management Information Systems
IDENTIFIERS *Richardson Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests methods for collecting and using student information for school improvement by describing how the Richardson Independent School District (RISD), Texas, determines data for effective school management decisionmaking. RISD readily accesses student information via a networked database on line with the central office's IBM mainframe and administrators' personal computers. District schools may quickly access the Richardson Instructional Management System (RIMS) on the TI 990 minicomputer via telecables or phone lines (using 2400-baud modems). Permanent records, secondary attendance, individual schedules, grades, standardized test scores, and demographics are maintained in mainframe files. The information that RIMS generates has several applications: first, these files interface with programs that show student mobility and identify at-risk and advanced students. Thus teachers can effectively diagnose and prescribe learning remediation or enhancement once they order the student data. Second, because students and teachers are identified by identification numbers, mailing labels are easily generated for research and evaluation surveys that may perhaps analyze efficient and effective teaching and learning. More applications for the system are presently being researched in a newly formed collaboration with six other ISDs and the graduate school of education at Texas A & M University. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303886

COLLECTING AND USING STUDENT INFORMATION FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

by

N. Blyth Riegel, Ph.D.

Director — Research and Evaluation
Richardson Independent School District

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 8, 1988.

EA 020 707

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N Blyth Riegel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COLLECTING AND USING STUDENT INFORMATION FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

N. Blyth Riegel, Ph.D.

> ..."*Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?*"
> "*That depends a good deal on where you want to get to,*" *said the Cat.*
> "*I don't much care where —*" *said Alice.*
> "*Then it doesn't matter which way you go,*" *said the Cat.*
> "*—so long as I get* somewhere," *Alice added as an explanation.*
> "*Oh, you're sure to do that,*" *said the Cat,*"*if you only walk long enough.*" [1]

Many of us involved for the last twenty years in educational evaluation may well feel as though the Cheshire Cat designed the roadmap for the last decade of student assessment. One legitimate and effective use of student performance and other management information is to enable and facilitate the making of plans to spend monies judiciously, in order to derive maximum benefit. Budgets are getting shorter and tighter every year, and this trend appears to be continuing. In the area of educational expenditures, we are all pretty much in the same boat: trying to make sense out of myriad data, some of which have only recently been formulated well enough to be valid, accurate, and standardized in definition.

We live in the age of accountability, and we have witnessed statewide assessment burgeon into a rejuvenated, full-fledged, and federally *well*-funded national assessment program, for the explicit purpose of state-by-state comparisons. Sometimes, the need and demand for educational management information can become a consuming addiction: data may be required that eventually prove to be either redundant or of marginal utility.

---

[1] Carroll, Lewis. *The Annotated Alice: Alice' s Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking Glass.* New York: Branham Hall, 1960, p. 88.

The identification of educational management information meeting high standards of both utility and validity is a developing science, yet it sometimes admittedly resembles more closely an art form. This paper is an accounting of one local educational agency's attempt to determine highly effective and valid data for management decisionmaking, and then to make that data readily accessible to managers at all levels. Part of the constraints for the database design have been the emerging requirements for the state department's newly born database for instructional management. Therefore, the interaction and accommodation of data needs at both the local and state levels will also be considered.

The Richardson ISD Coordinated Database

The Richardson Independent School District (RISD) has a current enrollment of approximately 34,000 students K-12 and preschool. There are 35 elementary, nine junior high, and four senior high schools in the district. Richardson itself is a northern and well established suburb of Dallas, comprised mostly of middle to upper socioeconomic families. Ethnic proportions average 9% Black, 3% each Hispanic and Oriental, and 85% Anglo and other nationalities. Median percentiles in the basic skill areas are well above the national norm, and generally more than 50% of the students at grade levels tested score in the top quartile. Mobility is a concern at selected schools and not a districtwide problem. However, these nonhomogeneous contextual variables create a challenge for school improvement and evaluation, especially in a state which has in recent years leaned towards a "wall-chart" approach to campus and district comparisons.

Nearly three years ago, the need for valid, timely, and accessible management information led to the design of RISD's **coordinated database**, a comprehensive system of student demographic and performance files linked to other sources of context data. The coordinated database (CDB) is actually comprised of various files on the regional educational service center IBM mainframe, the student database on the RISD TI 990/12 minicomputer, and a few files and databases residing on central administrative personal computers -- TI PCs; IBM XTs, ATs, and clones; and Macintosh SEs. Originally, there were two difficulties to be resolved in order to render the student data both usable and accessible to decisionmakers:

- A plan was needed for the electronic reduction and maintenance of the information.

- A plan was also needed for linking the various files and databases and offering user-friendly reports and screens.

At the present time, a large proportion of the student database resides on the Richardson Instructional Management System (RIMS) on the TI 990 minicomputer. Appendix A contains a current "roadmap" to RIMS, showing all available menu options. Each school accesses RIMS via either telecable or phone lines (using 2400-baud modems). Some of the data are installed centrally, such as standardized test results and many of the special program codes. Student demographic information and mastery results by skill in mathematics and language arts are input at the campuses.

Newly enrolled students are entered on the database by data technicians and office staff in the schools. School staff also withdraw students, using several codes which address the newly formulated state education dropout/at-risk mandates as well as district mobility information needs (see Appendix B for the withdrawal codes). The withdrawn students' records are transferred to a "holding school" on the database for two years, in case the student re-enrolls (as many do). A mobility record is also generated, which will be used in efficiency and effectiveness analyses after the end of the academic year. As records are requested to be transferred out-of-district to the student's receiving school, this information is also maintained on the database, where it is used to generate state-required student audit reports and to monitor the integrity of the mobility file regarding dropout status.

Not all of the student data, however, resides in RIMS. The permanent records, secondary grades, and student attendance file are maintained on the regional service center IBM mainframe. Student demographic data and the secondary master schedule are also on the IBM, although these files are involved in daily uploads and downloads from the TI minicomputer, thereby keeping some of the student data current though duplicated for the time being. Current plans are to move *all* student services data onto one database within the next few years.

The last three years have been spent in refining the central functions of the student database on the TI minicomputer; implementing upload and download processes which are efficient and user-friendly; and designing reports and screens for school and administrative staff which are highly

efficient, informative, and facilitative of decisionmaking. Reports and screens meet five basic information needs:

- Student diagnosis/prescription
- Instructional management
- School effectiveness/efficiency evaluation
- Program evaluation
- Parent communication

Classroom and campus summaries of student performance can be ordered for all students; for specific ethnic categories or special program codes; and for crosssectional data or cohort groups. Campus summaries are presented with subdistrict and total district averages as a comparison; in addition, campus averages are included on classroom summaries. Appendix C contains several student performance summaries as an illustration.

Failure rates by grade, by campus will be added to the CDB by the end of summer 1988. These data are now derived each reporting period by massaging on PCs the figures printed on summary reports from the IBM mainframe grade files. A download process will soon be implemented which will remove the interim data-massage step and make the failure report available as soon as grade reports have been generated. Additionally, a districtwide committee is currently reviewing a computerized elementary grade reporting system which, if implemented, would enable similar automated report summaries at the elementary level.

Deciding "Where To Get To"

It is this author's opinion that *every* database application, including additions or revisions to the data dictionary, should begin with the same question: "What do I really want to *learn* or *know* from the information?" In fact, many applications in all facets of information management (including survey design and statistical analysis) can be most easily determined from this original starting point. RISD uses a campus-based management system, where the principal is empowered with a total budget and FTE instructional allocation. He or she then develops a campus action plan to spend these resources in order to accomplish stated, measurable outcomes. The action plan is comprehensive and addresses student performance outcomes, professional development goals, and many other aspects of school success.

Appendix D contains a summary listing of the kinds of information needed to evaluate the success of district action plans. On the CDB, these data are represented in much greater detail. For example, each campus norm-referenced achievement record is identified by test; grade level tested; year tested; subtest; cohort duration; and ethnic identification. All data elements included on the CDB for any information were determined by identifying *what was to be learned* from the information.

As an illustration, Table 1 displays the data dictionary entry for the student mobility record. Each student is entered into this file with a record sequence number (MOB-SEQ) equal to zero (0) upon original enrollment during the school year. As the student exits and returns or transfers between schools, additional records with consecutive sequence numbers are added to the file. At the end of the school year, the contents of this file will be analyzed for mobility patterns and student profiles by linking to student performance and demographic records.

Table 2 displays an extract from the mobility file, containing records for two highly mobile students. Student A (020031) spent no more than four weeks at any school (including the non-RISD school) within a two-and-a-half month period last fall and left RISD twice in this period. As of today, this student has not re-enrolled in RISD. Student B (150075) spent three months in one school from the beginning of the school year, transferred to another RISD school, and then transferred after one month to yet another RISD school.

It is easy to recognize the power of this type of information, both to assist in identifying at-risk students and to compute a **turmoil** or turnover index for each campus. Administratively coping with large numbers of these kinds of students takes a toll on the resources of a school, both in terms of budget and staff time/energy. Without the CDB, continuity of student records is difficult to maintain for certain subpopulations. These subpopulations are precisely the students who most likely need to receive extra services (compensatory, ESL, special education, etc.), but determining their needs is a serious problem when there is limited accessibility to valid data. Just having norm-referenced data for these students available in a form so that it can follow them around and reappear when needed as the student re-enters RISD, is a major asset of the CDB.

TABLE 1. Format of the Student Mobility File.

POSITION	DATANAME	SIZE	TYPE	DESCRIPTION
1	MOB-RECORD	24	Group	Mobility record
1	MOB-KEY	4	Binary	Key for record
1	MOB-ID	3	Binary	Student ID #
4	MOB-SEQ	1	Binary	Sequence #
5	MOB-SCH-SEND	2	Binary	Sending school #
7	MOB-SCH-RECV	2	Binary	Receiving school#
9	MOB-DATE	3	Binary	Date withdrawn
12	MOB-GRADE	1	Binary	Grade level
13	MOB-CODE	1	Binary	Mobility code
14	MOB-ENTRY-DATE	3	Binary	Date re-entered
17	MOB-ENTRY-CODE	1	Alpha	Re-entry code
18	MOB-FILLER	7	Alpha	Filler

TABLE 2. Extracted Student Mobility Records

STUDENT A

SEQUENCE NUMBER	STUDENT ID #	SENDING SCHOOL	RECEIVING SCHOOL	GRADE	WITHDRAWAL DATE	WITHDRAWAL REASON
0	020031	318	397	4	09/21/87	Orig. Entry - NEW
1	020031	397	318	4	10/20/87	W/D to Other ISD
2	020031	318	397	4	11/11/87	R/E Transfer in RISD
3	020031	397	340	4	12/03/87	W/D to Other ISD

STUDENT B

SEQUENCE NUMBER	STUDENT ID #	SENDING SCHOOL	RECEIVING SCHOOL	GRADE	WITHDRAWAL DATE	WITHDRAWAL REASON
0	150075	317	317	6	09/01/87	Orig. Entry - BOY
1	150075	317	397	6	12/09/87	W/D Transfer in RISD
2	150075	397	340	6	12/10/87	R/E Transfer in RISD
3	150075	340	397	6	01/04/88	W/D Transfer in RISD
4	150075	397	334	6	01/04/88	R/E Transfer in RISD

When classes regroup in September, teachers can order profiles of their classes on standardized test results from earlier years, or previous mastery-by-skill information in language arts and mathematics. Thus, much time is saved by benefitting from previously collected information which is availlable for easy resorting into new groupings. Standard reports generated automatically from the CDB are also available to central program managers. Many of these reports were previously compiled laboriously by hand (e.g., students listed alphabetically by grade within special programs; talented and gifted candidates based on current test results; potential at-risk students). The CDB is providing central administrators as well as school staff labor- and time-saving functions which facilitate more effective and efficient performance of their respective job duties.

There are other benefits from the collective data on the CDB. Many data collection processes are now done with scan forms that were preslugged from the CDB. Both student and teacher ID numbers are contained in the database, keyed to schools and classes/periods. In addition to student responses on standardized testing, inservice evaluation responses are collected using preslugged and preprinted scan forms, custom-designed for the RISD inservice program. Random samples are also drawn from teacher and student files and mailing labels are generated for research and/or evaluation surveys. All of these functions are available to school and central staff alike. Efficiency and effectiveness analyses are also performed centrally each year using campus-level data. These results are included in the campus performance profiles and are based on data accessible by school staff on the CDB.

How Far Do We Have To Walk?

It appears that the overall database design for RISD is in good shape. The main improvements to be made in the near future involve expanding hardware to enable student services files to reside on one computer only (instead of the partial duplication which now exists). In fact, when the state dropout database requirements were announced earlier this year, the decision was made that RISD would offer itself as a pilot for both additional dropout and student services data collection. As additional intradistrict needs for reports and/or screens are identified, these requests will be reviewed by a management information advisory committee for approval and prioritization .

RISD has also been a participant for over a year in a newly formed research collaborative with six other ISDs and the graduate school of education at Texas A & M University. As a result of the pioneering work done by this group, all members of the collaborative are being regarded as advisors to the state database and at-risk coordinators for programmatic and procedural design recommendations. Two of the original goals of the collaborative were to conduct research that would both impact policy and procedure at the state level, and be **proactive** in effect rather than the usual reactive, *knee-jerk* response usually afforded ISDs when lead time is short and databases are inadequate to answer questions.

In short, it seems that we in RISD have found a short-cut to "where we need to get to," merely by spending some time in the early stages of reacting to management information needs by applying principles of common sense, coupled with expertise in planning. Texas has been consistently hard-hit within the last several years with educational reforms. Many ISDs have not yet had the time to catch their collective breaths and review which heading they should next consider. When it seems that a response is needed and needed ***now***, regardless of the quality or accuracy of that response, *making the time* to review options from a perspective of future needs sometimes appears to be an unaffordable luxury. However, to respond from any other position will almost certainly guarantee that the "walk" there will be *much longer* in the end.

APPENDIX A

Roadmap to the Richardson Instructional Management System (RIMS)

*** RIMS *** RICHARDSON INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM Menu Chart
December 10, 1987

- 1 Student Demographics - File & Reports
  - 1 Student File Maintenance
  - 2 Display Lists of Students by Special Programs
  - 3 Reports Menu
    - 1 Print Student List by ID
    - 2 Print Student List by Grade/Alpha
    - 3 Print Student List by Advisor/Alpha
    - 4 Print Student List by Alpha
    - 5 Print Parent's Name Labels
    - 6 Print "To the Guardian of" Labels
    - 7 Print Student's Name Labels
    - 8 Student Counts by Grade and Ethnicity
    - 9 RIMS System Print Function
  - 4 Student Withdrawal
  - 5 Student Reentry
  - 6 Request for Transfer of Student Records
  - 7 Browse Student File
  - 8 RIMS System Print Function
- 2 Teacher File and Reports
  - 1 Add a Teacher
  - 2 Change Teacher Information
  - 3 Delete a Teacher
  - 4 Display a Single Teacher
  - 5 List Teachers by Number
  - 6 Print Teacher List - Alpha Sequence
  - 7 RIMS System Print Function
- 3 Class Roster File and Reports
  - 1 Add a New Class
  - 2 Edit Class Information
  - 3 Delete a Class
  - 4 Display a Teacher's Classes
  - 5 Print Class Rosters
  - 6 Display Class Rosters
  - 7 Mass Add Students into a Class
  - 8 Transfer a Student to Another Class
  - 9 Mass Delete Students from a Class
  - 10 Copy a Roster to Another Class
  - 11 Browse Student File
  - 12 RIMS System Print Function

```
|
|                                  |- 1 Display Essential Element File
|                                  |- 2 Display School File
|                                  |- 3 List School File
|                                  |- 4 Change Passwords
|- 4 System Files - - - - - - - -  |- 5 Print School List
|                                  |- 6 RIMS System Print Function
|                                  |- 7 Display Objective File
|                                  |- 8 List Objectives File
|                                  |- 9 Print Objectives List
|                                  |- 10 List Techniques File
|                                  |- 11 Print Techniques List
|
|
|- 5 Remediation File and - - -    | *** not yet implemented ***
|    Reports
|
|
|                                  |- 1 Certify Mastery by Student
|                                  |- 2 Certify Mastery by Objective
|                                  |- 3 Certify Mastery by Test Booklet
|- 6 Student Mastery by - - -      |- 4 Process Skills Menu - Keyboard Input
|     Certification                |- 5 Certify Mastery - Keyboard Input
|                                  |- 6 Display Student Mastery Records
|                                  |- 7 Browse Student File
|
|
|
|
|
|                                  |- 1 Keyboard Entry of Tests Answers
|                                  |- 2 Change/Delete Test Answers
|                                  |- 3 Print Edit Listing of Test Answers
|- 7 Student Mastery by - - -      |- 4 Post Test Answers to Master File
|    Testing                       |- 5 Select Rosters for Preslugged Scan Sheets
|                                  |- 6 Upload & Post Scanner Data
|                                  |- 7 Display Student Mastery Records
|                                  |- 8 RIMS System Print Function
|
|
```

	|- 1 Individual Student Mastery
	|- 2 Mastery Summary by Essential Element
	|- 3 Nonmastery Exception Summary -- by Student
	|- 4 Nonmastery Exception Summary -- by Objective
	|- 5 Comprehensive Student Summary
|- 8 Student Mastery- - - - - Reports	|- 6 K.A.P.R. Reports -- 1 Roster Batch (print at campus)
	|- 7 Students' Reports -- Batch Request (print at D.P.)
	|- 8 Students' Reports -- 1 Roster Batch (print at campus)
	|- 9 Historical - Individual Student Mastery
	|- 10 Historical - Nonmastery Report by Student
	|- 11 Historical - Nonmastery Report by Objective
	|- 12 Historical - Students' Reports - 1 Advisor Batch
	|- 13 RIMS System Print Function
	|- 14 Display Student Mastery
	|- 1 Display Student Achievement
	|- 2 Individual Student Achievement Report
	|- 3 Classroom Summary by Test
	|- 4 Classroom Summary - Subtest Histogram
	|- 5 Campus Summary by Test
|- 9 ITBS/TAP/TEAMS/- - - COGAT/DAT Reports	|- 6 Campus Summary by Test and Ethnicity
	|- 7 Campus Summary by Grade - Subtest Histogram
	|- 8 Campus Summary - Quartile Chart
	|- 9 Campus TEAMS Summary - Mastery by Objective
	|- 10 Browse Student File
	|- 11 RIMS System Print Function

RIMS SYSTEM PRINT FUNCTION MENU

|- 1 Print Current Report
|- 2 Delete Current Report
|- 3 Browse Current Report
|- 4 Accumulate Current Report
|- 5 Print Accumulated Reports
|- 6 Delete Accumulated Reports
|- 7 Browse Accumulated Reports

APPENDIX B

Withdrawal Codes

CODES: WITHDRAWAL REASONS

1	Transfer to Another RISD School	
2	Entry to Private School	
3	Entry to Another Public School/District	ISD in Texas or other public, fulltime, accredited educational institution
4	Commitment to an Institution	Prison, mental or juvenile institution, etc.
5	Enrollment in Fulltime, State-Approved Program	Vocational education, Individual Education Plan (IEP), state-approved GED program, or any other state-approved alternative program
6	Early Graduation	Sufficient credits earned and Exit-Level TEAMS passed
7	Death	
8	Expulsion	
9	Failure to Pass Exit-Level TEAMS	
10	Passing Compulsory School Age	
11	Marriage	
12	Pregnancy	
13	Fulltime Employment	
14	Social/Economic Factors	Any other reasons stated which can be described as realting to social or economic conditions of the student or his/her family
15	30+ Consecutive Unexcused Absences	This category is to be used for no-shows at the beginning of the school year or any other student who is absent from school for at least 30 consecutive school days without excuse (H.B.1010 definition of "dropout"): i.e., any AWOL student
16	Other Stated Reason	Any other reason ***stated*** by the student or his/her parent/guardian not covered by reasons 1 - 14 above, including teaching the child at home by choice
17	No-Show	Enrolled student fails to show up the first day of school (actually allow first *ten* school days to determine status and exit students)

9/21/88 R&E

APPENDIX C

Sample Student Performance Reports

1. Individual Student Reports

   - Fourth Grade Student (two pages)
   - Fifth Grade Student (one page)
   - Eighth Grade Student (two pages)

2. Classroom Summaries: Tabular Format — All Students

   - CogAT — Third Grade Results for a Fifth Grade Class
   - TEAMS — Fifth Grade Results for a Sixth Grade Class
   - DAT — Eighth Grade Results for an Eightth Grade Class

3. Classroom Summary on DAT: Histogram Format (extracted page)

4. Campus Summaries

   - TEAMS — Ninth Grade Cross-Sectional Results for Past Two Years, by Objective (Math only)
   - TEAMS — Seventh Grade Cross-Sectional Results for Past Two Years, Subtest Mastery Totals
   - TAP — Ninth Grade Cross-Sectional Results for Past Two Years, Interquartile Distributions

Individual Student Achievement Report

udent Name	Student #	Grade	Advisor
[redacted]	[redacted]	4	[redacted]

st : Year/Grade Tested Subtest	Student Score	Campus Median	Area Median	RISD Median
GAT: Fall 1986/Grade 3 (Ability Score)				
Verbal	117	108.5	107.0	110.0
Quantitative	107	108.0	108.0	110.0
Nonverbal	102	109.5	109.0	111.0
BS : Spr 1986/Grade 2 (%-ile Rank)				
Reading Comprehension	75	75	61	68
Language Total	71	86	86	86
Math Total	57	80	88	93

Individual Student Achievement Report

ident Name [redacted] Student # [redacted] Grade 4 Advisor [redacted]

st : Year/Grade Tested Subtest	Student Score	Campus Median	Area Median	RISD Median
MS: Spr 1987/Grade 3 (see Note)				
Mathematics Total	Y	97	96	97
ORDER WHOLE NUMBERS	Y	100	97	98
PLACE VALUE	Y	97	99	98
NUMBER PATTERNS	Y	95	94	95
EXPANDED NOTATION	Y	97	98	98
FRACTIONAL PARTS	Y	100	99	99
ADDITION	Y	95	98	98
SUBTRACTION	Y	97	94	95
WORD PROBLEMS (+)	Y	100	97	98
WORD PROBLEMS (-)	Y	97	96	97
MEASUREMENT UNITS	Y	97	94	94
PICTORIAL MODELS	Y	95	97	97
eading	Y	97	94	94
MAIN IDEA	Y	94	91	93
SIGHT WORDS	Y	94	96	96
CONTEXT CLUES	Y	97	92	91
WORD STRUCTURE	Y	69	70	75
PHONICS	N	89	89	89
SPECIFIC DETAILS	Y	97	97	97
SEQUENCING OF EVENTS	Y	100	97	97
PREDICTING OUTCOMES	Y	89	91	91
TABLE OF CONTENTS	Y	97	99	99
riting Total	Y	94	92	92
CAPITALIZATION	Y	100	98	99
PUNCTUATION	Y	94	92	93
SPELLING	Y	97	97	98
CORRECT ENGLISH USAGE	Y	97	98	99
SENTENCE STRUCTURE	Y	94	96	95
PROOFREADING	Y	100	98	99
Writing Composition Score	2	2.4	2.5	2.6

ote: (TEAMS only) Student Score = passing the subtest (Y/N)
-or- mastering the objective (Y/N)

Campus, Area and RISD Medians = %age of students passing the subtest
-or- mastering the objective

Individual Student Achievement Report

udent Name [redacted] Student # [redacted] Grade 5 Advisor [redacted]

st : Year/Grade Tested Subtest	Student Score	Campus Median	Area Median	RISD Median
GAT: Fall 1985/Grade 3 (Ability Score)				
Verbal	117	111.0	107.0	109.0
Quantitative	110	108.0	108.0	109.0
Nonverbal	107	111.0	110.0	110.0
BS : Spr 1986/Grade 3 (%-ile Rank)				
Reading Comprehension	53	99	90	90
Language Total	69		79	87
Math Total	30		73	79
BS : Spr 1987/Grade 4 (%-ile Rank)				
Reading Comprehension	30	64	74	74
Language Total	53	93	90	90
Math Total	30	91	91	91

Individual Student Achievement Report

ıdent Name	Student #	Grade	Advisor
[redacted]	[redacted]	8	** NOT FOUND **

;t : Year/Grade Tested Subtest	Student Score	Campus Median	Area Median	RISD Median
T : Fall 1987/Grade 8 (%-ile Rank M/F)				
Verbal Reasoning	90/90			
Numerical Ability	90/90			
Verbal Reas. + Num. Abil.	90/90			
Abstract Reasoning	75/70			
Clerical Speed & Accuracy	40/25			
Mechanical Reasoning	70/90			
Space Relations	85/90			
Spelling	70/55			
Language Usage	90/85			
BS : Spr 1986/Grade 6 (%-ile Rank)				
Reading Comprehension	91		73	81
Language Total	78		80	83
Math Total	96		92	92
Social Studies	99			
Science	91			

Individual Student Achievement Report

udent Name [redacted] Student # [redacted] Grade 8 Advisor ** NOT FOUND **

st : Year/Grade Tested Subtest	Student Score	Campus Median	Area Median	RISD Median
AMS: Spr 1987/Grade 7 (see Note)				
Mathematics Total	Y	99	98	98
EQUIVALENCIES	Y	96	96	97
FRACTIONS (+,-)	Y	95	94	94
DECIMALS (+,-,X,/)	Y	77	81	83
WORD PROBLEMS (+,-,X,/)	Y	89	87	88
DECIMAL WORD PROBLEMS (+,-,X)	Y	96	93	91
MEASUREMENT UNITS	Y	95	93	92
GEOMETRIC TERMS AND FIGURES	Y	94	93	93
PERIMETER OF POLYGONS	Y	98	98	97
CHARTS, GRAPHS	Y	98	96	96
PROBABILITY	Y	95	90	92
EQUATIONS	Y	92	91	91
Reading	Y	98	96	96
MAIN IDEA	Y	79	73	74
CONTEXT CLUES	Y	99	99	99
SPECIFIC DETAILS	Y	92	89	90
SEQUENCING OF EVENTS	Y	80	74	72
DRAWING CONCLUSIONS	Y	83	80	79
FACT, OPINION	Y	76	70	69
GRADE 7 READING OBJ #7	Y	87	84	85
REFERENCE SOURCES	Y	99	98	99
GRAPHIC SOURCES	Y	98	98	98
PARTS OF A BOOK	Y	97	96	97
Writing Total	Y	93	91	94
CAPITALIZATION	Y	96	96	97
PUNCTUATION	Y	90	91	92
SPELLING	Y	90	86	89
CORRECT ENGLISH USAGE	Y	95	92	93
SENTENCE STRUCTURE	Y	83	85	86
PROOFREADING	Y	97	96	97
Writing Composition Score	3	2.3	2.3	2.7

Note: (TEAMS only) Student Score = passing the subtest (Y/N) .
-or- mastering the objective (Y/N)

Campus, Area and RISD Medians = %age of students passing the subtest
-or- mastering the objective

Classroom Summary by Test
Texas Educational Assessment of Minimal Skills (TEAMS)

CHER [redacted] YEAR/GRADE TESTED: Spring 1987/Grade 5
'IOD 1 Reg Instr - 6th

nicity: ALL

#	Student Name	Total Math (Y/N)	Total Read. (Y/N)	Object. (Score)	Writing Compos. (0-4)	Total (Y/N)
	[redacted]	Y	Y	22	3	Y
		Y	Y	22	4	Y
		Y	Y	24	4	Y
		Y	Y	20	3	Y
		Y	Y	24	2	Y
		Y	Y	24	3	Y
		Y	Y	22	1	N
		Y	N	23	2	Y
		Y	Y	24	4	Y
		Y	Y	24	2	Y
		N	Y	24	4	Y
		Y	Y	21	3	Y
		Y	Y	23	3	Y
		Y	Y	23	3	Y
		Y	Y	20	3	Y
		Y	Y	20	2	Y
		Y	Y	23	2	Y
		Y	Y	24	2	Y
		Y	Y	24	2	Y
		Y	Y	22	3	Y
		Y	Y	22	2	Y

Classroom Summary by Test
Cognitive Abilities Tests (CogAT)

TEACHER [redacted] YEAR/GRADE TESTED: Fall 1985/Grade 3
PERIOD 1 Reg Instr - 5th

Ethnicity: ALL

ID #	Student Name	- ABILITY SCORES - BY SUBTEST - Verbal	Quantitative	Nonverbal	Recommended TAG Status
[redacted]		120	108	123	
		101	103	99	
		106	104	101	
		115	94	84	
		130	117	125	C
		103	92	102	
		101	94	130	
		111	108	119	
		125	108	107	
		89	78	98	
		87	92	100	
		84	89	90	
		126	117	127	
		113	120	111	

Note: 'C' = Conditional Placement in REACH
'Y' = REACH Candidate

Classroom Summary by Test
Differential Aptitude Tests (DAT)

TEACHER [redacted]
PERIOD 1 LANG ARTS 8

YEAR/GRADE TESTED: Fall 1987/Grade 8

Ethnicity: ALL

D #	Student Name		PERCENTILES BY SUBTEST								
			VR	NA	VR+NA	AL	CS&A	MR	SR	Sp	LU
[redacted]		M	90	70	85	85	20	75	75	30	99
		F	90	60	85	85	10	90	75	20	99
[redacted]		M	90	90	90	75	40	70	85	70	90
		F	90	90	90	70	25	90	90	55	85
[redacted]		M	95	90	95	95	30	90	85	90	95
		F	95	90	95	95	20	99	90	85	95
[redacted]		M	70	70	70	45	75	25	55	95	85
		F	70	65	65	45	65	45	60	90	75
[redacted]		M	95	70	90	65	65	55	70	95	95
		F	95	65	90	60	50	80	75	90	90
[redacted]		M	90	90	90	90	20	25	99	95	97
		F	90	90	90	90	10	45	99	95	95
[redacted]		M	80	70	75	75	95	15	75	60	95
		F	80	65	75	70	90	35	80	45	90
[redacted]		M	90	75	85	80	20	60	70	50	90
		F	90	70	85	80	10	85	75	35	80
[redacted]		M	99	99	99	99	60	99	97	90	97
		F	99	99	99	99	45	99	99	85	95
[redacted]		M	99	99	99	99	95	90	95	95	99
		F	99	99	99	97	90	97	97	95	99
[redacted]		M	85	95	90	75	97	65	80	60	95
		F	85	95	90	75	97	90	85	45	85
[redacted]		M	90	90	90	95	90	85	85	90	99
		F	90	90	90	95	85	97	85	85	97
[redacted]		M	95	95	95	80	40	45	80	97	90
		F	95	95	95	80	25	70	85	95	80

VR = Verbal Reasoning
NA = Numerical Ability
VR+NA = Verb.Reas.+ Num.Abil.
AR = Abstract Reasoning
CS&A = Clerical Speed & Accur.
MR = Mechanical Reasoning
SR = Space Relations
Sp = Spelling
LU = Language Usage

15-H

Classroom Summary - Subtest Histogram
Differential Aptitude Tests (DAT)

ACHER [redacted]
RIOD 3 ALGEBRA I

YEAR/GRADE TESTED: 1986/Grade 8
SUBTEST: Numerical Ability

nicity: ALL

ID #	Student		%ile	PERCENTILES 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
[redacted]		M	65	----------] =
		F	55	----------] =
[redacted]		M	80	----------=-]
		F	75	----------=
[redacted]		M	90	----------=------]
		F	90	----------=------]
[redacted]		M	85	----------=----]
		F	85	----------=----]
[redacted]		M	75	----------=
		F	70	----------] =
[redacted]		M	80	----------=-]
		F	80	----------=-]
[redacted]		M	90	----------=------]
		F	90	----------=------]
[redacted]		M	80	----------=-]
		F	75	----------=
[redacted]		M		=
		F		=
[redacted]		M		=
		F		=
[redacted]		M	65	----------] =
		F	55	----------] =
[redacted]		M	75	----------=
		F	75	----------=
[redacted]		M	85	----------=----]
		F	85	----------=----]
[redacted]		M	75	----------=
		F	75	----------=

Note: '|' indicates Campus Median (All Students)
'*' indicates RISD Median (All Students)
'=' indicates Campus = RISD Median

Texas Educational Assessment of Minimal Skills (TEAMS)
Campus Summary - Mastery by Objective

GRADE TESTED: 9 SUBTEST: MATHEMATICS

Objective	Year	% age	--- PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS --- MASTERING --- 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
EQUVALENCIES	1986	95	----------]
	1987	95	----------]
FRACTIONS (+,-)	1986	95	----------]
	1987	97	----------]
DECIMALS (X,/)	1986	98	----------]
	1987	97	----------]
WORD PROBLEMS (+,-,X,/)	1986	98	----------]
	1987	96	----------]
WORD PROB.(RATIO, PROPORT., %)	1986	90	----------]
	1987	91	----------]
PERSONAL FINANCE PROBLEMS	1986	87	----------]
	1987	84	----------]
WORD PROB. (MEASUREMENT UNITS)	1986	94	----------]
	1987	92	----------]
AREA OF RECTANGLES, TRIANGLES	1986	75	----------]
	1987	85	----------]
PROBABILITY	1986	79	----------]
	1987	87	----------]
CHARTS, GRAPHS	1986	88	----------]
	1987	80	----------]
FORMULAS	1986	94	----------]
	1987	98	----------]

Campus Summary by Grade - Subtest Histogram
Texas Educational Assessment of Minimal Skills (TEAMS)

AR/GRADE TESTED: Spring 1987/Grade 7

test		% age	------ PERCENTAGE MASTERED ------ 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
hematics		99	----------]
	AREA	98	----------]
	RISD	98	----------]
ding		98	----------]
	AREA	96	----------]
	RISD	96	----------]
ting/Lang. Arts Total		93	----------]
	AREA	91	----------]
	RISD	94	----------]

Richardson Instructional Management System

[redacted] Junior High

Campus Summary - Quartile Chart
Tests of Achievement & Proficiency (TAP)

ADE TESTED: 9

test	Year	--- PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ---- ----- WITHIN EACH QUARTILE ----- 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100	% Q1	% Q2	% Q3	% Q4	% > Median
ding Comprehension	1986	==========++++++++++++++++!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	7	18	32	43	75
	1987	======--------++++++++++++++++!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	12	17	33	39	72
hematics	1986	==========++++++++++++++++!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	6	14	33	47	80
	1987	==========++++++++++++++!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	9	12	28	51	79
tten Expression	1986	==========++++++++++++++++++!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	7	15	37	42	79
	1987	==========++++++++++++++++++!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	8	15	33	45	78
of Sources	1986	==========++++++++++++!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	8	17	24	52	76
	1987	======--------++++++++++++!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	10	15	24	50	74
ial Studies	1986	==========++++++++++++++++++!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	8	16	34	42	76
ence	1986	==========++++++++++++++!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	9	16	26	50	76

Q1: 1st - 25th %ile
Q2: 26th - 50th %ile
Q3: 51st - 75th %ile
Q4: 76th - 99th %ile

APPENDIX D

Indicators to Evaluate District Vital Signs

CRITICAL VITAL INDICATORS FOR STRATEGIC PLAN

Student Performance

Achievement Data (longitudinal by cohort and cross-sectional)

- Median percentiles by subtest
- Quartile proportions
- Profit margin statistics

Criterion-Referenced Data (longitudinal by cohort and cross-sectional)

- TEAMS mastery percentages by subtest
- Mastery percentages by essential element from RIMS

Failure Rates: analyzed with achievement and criterion-referenced data

Grades (elementary and secondary): analyzed with achievement and criterion-referenced and other data

Mobility patterns and rates

Comprehensive Curriculum

Profile of retained and compensatory education students: based on mobility and drop-out databases, using achievement and other test data, failure rates, grades, etc.

Longitudinal follow-up study

Effective Teachers

Employee Absence Reporting System (EARS) Summary

Summary statistics on TTAS data

RECOMMEND EXPANDING AVAILABLE DATA IN THIS AREA

Organization and Management

Efficiency and effectiveness statistics by campus

Inservice evaluation results for instructional leadership topics

Finance

Summary of program expenditures by organization, function, etc.

Trend analysis of expenditure data for last 15 years, by major categories

Parent and Community Involvement

Marketing research results

Mastery reports home to parents three times/yr (from RIMS)

Innovation

Plan for dissemination of collaborative research results

RECOMMEND EXPAND AVAILABLE DATA HERE

Communications

Community survey of teaching profession

Evaluation results of action plans